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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear BioMed Central Editorial Team

Thank you again for the peer review comments on our manuscript “Parenthood, information and support on the internet. A literature review of research on parents and professionals online”. We appreciated especially the comments from reviewer 1, Gauthier Bouche, as they really were helpful in our work to improve the article; both this time and the first time. After the first review round we considered almost all comments accept from those concerning the quality assessment of the selected research. The main reason for this was that our study is a scope review and therefore mainly focuses on what we know about “parenthood and internet”. The reviewer (Gauthier Bouche) found this explanation as adequate and useful and therefore accepted our arguments. However, in this second review, we have accepted all comments and revised the manuscript according to the reviewers’ comments.

Following changes has been made:

• We have considered and removed the reference to Cotten and Gupta on page 12.
• We have added a new section about the readability of the information you can find on the internet on page 15. We have also used all the suggested literature references on this topic.
• On page 18 we have extended the discussion on the quality of different web sites by adding a section about Eysenbach & Köhlers (2002) study.
• We have rewritten the abstract and extended the discussions on the result of the review.
• We have shortened the methods section by one page and instead referred to our previous article for more details.
• We have updated figures, corrected misspellings and removed redundant paragraphs in the whole article.
• We have checked all references and the presentation of them in the text
• We have shortened the conclusion by almost 1 page to get it more clearly.
By doing these improvements and fully following the reviewers comments, we hope the editorial team now finds the article suitable for publication in BMC Family Practice.

Yours sincerely

Kristian Daneback and Lars Plantin